

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ospto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,065	08/31/2000	George E. Corbin	POU920000026US1	2966
759	90 11/17/2004		EXAMINER	
William A Kinnaman Jr			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
IBM Corporation	n IPLAW			
2455 South Road M/S P386			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601			2178	
	•		DATE MAR EIN, 11/17/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	4
Advisory Action	09/652,065	CORBIN ET AL.	
navisory notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam L Basehoar	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	Iress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	ply to a cation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		·
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adversaria, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the shorteness o	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. It is sign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate extending the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee ttension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	•
(b) \(\square\) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)□ will not be entered or t ould be rejected is provided bel	o)□ will be entered ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:		•	
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			•
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme 10. Other:	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		_//_
	•		HENS. HONG

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not considered persuasive. The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant that the saveSnapshot behavior does not dynamically generate a new document containing user data and believes a newly created document was generated when the user data was saved locally in persisten form at a selected location on the user's hard drive.

With respect to Applicant's argument pertaining to the script block, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and refers to the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action.

The examiner also would like to point out that the code as listed in the saveSnapshot behavior are not a limiting factor and are merely examples of possible functionality. It also appears to the Examiner that the reference to the "save document 800 (Fig. 8)" on pages 32 and 33 of Applicant's remarks should reference Fig. 7 item 700 (Fig. 8 is the load document)..